

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

DON PHILIPPI,)	3:11-CV-0272-ECR (VPC)
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u>
)	
vs.)	July 18, 2011
)	
HOWARD SKOLNIK, et al.)	
)	
Defendant(s).)	
_____)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE VALERIE P. COOKE, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: _____ REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Plaintiff filed a motion for retaliation claim (#12). Defendants opposed the motion (#17). The court construes the motion for retaliation claim as a motion for leave to amend complaint.

Pursuant to Local Rule 15-1, plaintiff shall attach the proposed amended pleading to any motion to amend so that it will be complete in itself without reference to the superseding pleading. Plaintiff attached certain documents to his motion; however, plaintiff did not attach a proposed amended pleading that is complete in itself as required by LR 15-1. Therefore, plaintiff's motion for retaliation claim (#12) is **DENIED without prejudice**. Plaintiff shall have leave to file a proper motion to amend in which a new proposed first amended complaint is attached that is complete in itself without reference to the superseding pleading.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By: _____
Deputy Clerk